

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-27 stand rejected. Claims 1, 3, 8, 13, 18, and 23 are amended. Claims 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 are cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-19, 21-24, and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ginter et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,892,900). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ginter et al. is generally directed toward systems and methods for secure transaction management and electronic rights protection. However, the Examiner admits that Ginter et al. does not teach “representation modes” as recited in originally filed claims 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 as the contents include a plurality of representation modes; and the use restriction information represents the use prohibit ranges of the plurality of representation modes, the use allow ranges thereof, and the provisional use prohibit ranges thereof.

Applicants’ claimed invention is generally directed toward a contents providing service system, server apparatus, and client apparatus. In particular, Applicants’ claimed invention is directed toward the contents include a plurality of representation modes; and the use restriction information represents the use prohibit ranges of the plurality of representation modes, the use allow ranges thereof, and the provisional use prohibit ranges thereof. For example, each of the independent claims 1, 3, 8, 13, 18, and 23, as amended, recite “the contents include a plurality of representation modes;

and the use restriction information represents the use prohibit ranges of the plurality of representation modes, the use allow ranges thereof, and the provisional use prohibit ranges thereof.” Therefore, Ginter et al. does not teach all of the limitations recited in the independent claims. These differences are significant as explained below.

Previously, the Examiner has relied on Erickson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,765,152) to teach the feature of the representation modes as recited in claims 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 as originally filed. Erickson discloses a system that enables a user to edit information through a monitor in order to manage permission mode of the document based on the copyright and license information of the document (Figs. 5a-5b, 7a-7d). According to Erickson, the document itself is not modified and only a setting of the permission is edited.

Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Applicants believe that Erickson fails to disclose the feature of claims 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25. The Specification as originally filed from page 38, line 18 describes examples of the representation modes. According to the present invention, when changing the representation mode, the contents themselves are modified. Thus, Erickson fails to disclose the representation modes of the invention and the claimed invention is not obvious for persons skilled in the art even if Ginter et al. is modified in view of Erickson as alleged by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejections of independent claims 1, 3, 8, 13, 18, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), along with rejection on these grounds of all claims dependent therefrom.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,892,900) in view of Erickson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,765,152). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 are cancelled. Therefore, Applicant's believe the rejection of these claims to be moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 13, 2005

By: 
Jennifer S. Brooks
Reg. No. 51,501

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GAS/JSB]